University of Arkansas Libraries
Cross-Training Task Force
January 9, 2013
Room 486

Present: Molly Moore, Cheryl Conway, Cedar Middleton, Lynaire Hartsell, Martha Guirl-Phillips

Guirl-Phillips took minutes.

The group discussed the idea of a 3-tiered program involving the different levels of cross-training and decided to focus on tier 2 for the majority of the meeting.

*3-tiered structure like mentioned in forum.

1. Information/knowledge sharing level (2-8 hours a week, 1-3 months) no need to rewrite standards
2. In depth training level (8-10 hours a week, 3-6 months) might require rewriting standards
3. “job sharing”/exchange/swap (8-10 hours a week, up to 1 year) rewrite standards

Moore mentioned that a survey would be a good way to determine interests and needs of the organization for the new program. A two part survey could be created to find natural linkages of need and interest and help determine who gets training since we might have multiple interest in particular tasks and processes. Who devises the survey and who looks at the results remains a question to answer.

We discussed the issue of a “gatekeeper” of the program. Jones’s written comments were discussed and agreed upon concerning this issue. Jones mentioned NIU’s concept of a Cross Training Advisory Committee and how it seemed unnecessary for us at this point. We agreed that the process will inherently come with its own checks and balances between Host and Home. We hope that Human Resources will also fulfill this role because of the need for monitoring the cross-training relationships.

The group talked about the need to clarify and flesh out the process of applying and getting approval. We agreed that the existing template forms (application, evaluation, exit) would be good for us to use as a starting point. Guirl-Phillips mentioned that the forms will need to be on the staff web and Moore mentioned having an overview page like Yale’s “Cross-Training at a glance.” The group agreed that ours should contain criteria and eligibility of applicants as well as an outline of the program. It was questioned whether or not HR would approve us including the rule about a staff member not being eligible for the program if they have been written up in the last year/months. Guirl-Phillips was asked to pose this question to Jeff Banks.

The group discussed Jones’s notes about the “cycle” of the program. Although the group sees the need for a common time for reviewing applicants there seems to be no practical beginning and end to an actual program calendar. Addressing this issue in the report was agreed upon.

The “no fault” escape idea was discussed and everyone agreed that it was a necessary part of the program in order to give the Host and Home more flexibility if the program isn’t working out.

Best practices was touched upon but not really addressed fully.

We ended the meeting at 11:30am with a consensus to individually work on skeletal outlines of the program to further discuss at next week’s meeting.